

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12-21, 23, 25 and 26 are pending, with claim 1 being independent. By this amendment, claims 10 and 11 have been canceled and claims 25 and 26 have been added. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 10 and 11 have been canceled in response to the rejection under section 112, second paragraph. Cancellation of these claims obviates this rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 13-18, 21, 22 and 24 have been rejected as being anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Kester (U.S. Patent No. 6,008,975). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because, as has been previously noted, Kester does not describe or suggest a pre-impregnated composite matrix of fiberglass bundles and epoxy resin that continuously covers a circumferential surface of the one or more MOV disks, as recited in claim 1.

The rejection asserts that the matrix 21 of Kester corresponds to the recited matrix, with the tape 24 corresponding to a fiberglass bundle. However, the matrix 21 does not itself constitute a pre-impregnated composite and, instead, includes separate layers of resin (e.g., layers 22 and 25) and separate tape layers (e.g., tapes 24 and 28). Also, while the tape 24 could be said to correspond to a pre-impregnated composite, it does not continuously cover a circumferential surface of the MOV disk. Rather, as shown in Fig. 4 of Kester, the tape segments 24 only occupy short strips of the circumferential surface of the MOV disk. This point is more explicit with respect to new dependent claim 25, which recites that the pre-impregnated composite extends around the circumferential surface of the at least one MOV disk as a single continuous sheet, as discussed in the application at, for example, page 7, lines 8-16 and lines 28-31.

Applicants also request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because, as has been previously noted, Kester does not describe or suggest a pre-impregnated composite that is capable of withstanding an 80 kA fault current for 12 time cycles, as recited in claim 1. In response to this argument, the rejection asserts, in effect, that the "for 12 time cycles" limitation may be ignored by assigning any arbitrary value to the duration of the time cycle. Applicants

Applicant : Michael M. Ramarge
Serial No. : 10/800,645
Filed : March 16, 2004
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 08215-565001 / P05-027021

respectfully disagree and assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that a "time cycle," as that term is used in the claim, would correspond to a time cycle of an electrical system to which the arrester is connected (as now explicitly recited in dependent claim 26), such that an impulse could not include the recited 12 time cycles.

Claims 19 and 20 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Kester in view of Nedriga (U.S. Patent No. 5,047,891). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Nedriga does not remedy the failure of Kester to describe or suggest the features of claim 1.

Claims 6-9, 12, 19 and 20 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Kester in view of Nedriga, and further in view of Porter (U.S. Patent No. 5,763,043). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Porter does not remedy the failure of Kester and Nedriga to describe or suggest the features of claim 1.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$1810 check for the RCE fee (\$790) and the three-month Petition for Extension of Time fee (\$1020). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/28/05


John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

PTO Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331